

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/532,203	DREYFUSS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SAMIRA JEAN-LOUIS	1617	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SAMIRA JEAN-LOUIS. (3) _____

(2) Jane Massey Licata. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 03 December 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1-3.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Samira Jean-Louis/
Examiner, Art Unit 1617

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner contacted Attorney Licata regarding the election of species that was made in the Response filed 11/17/08. Attorney Licata called back and stated that indeed an election was made for group I with a compound of formula II and that the Examiner is incorrect in her requirement. The Examiner reiterated however that a particular compound of formula II needs to be elected and not the entire genus. Attorney Licata declined to make an oral election and re-stated that an election has already been made. The Examiner then informed Attorney Licata that the prosecution will continue which is interpreted by the Examiner that a non-responsive letter will be mailed out to Applicant.